Information Strategy Stakeholder Meeting

March 8-9, 2001

Meeting Summary

Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water (OGWDW) sponsored a meeting on March 8-9, 2001 with the objective of obtaining input from interested stakeholders regarding issues, options, and directions affecting the future of national drinking water and source water information systems and related activities supporting the protection of public health.[1] The meeting agenda can be found as Attachment A. Participants at the meeting included representatives of public water utilities, state drinking water programs, public health and environmental groups, municipal and provincial governments, consultants, and water distribution systems, as well as U.S. EPA and other federal agencies. A list of participants is included as Attachment B. The meeting format consisted of a series of presentations by EPA staff focusing on the current thinking and approach of EPA in developing a new Information Strategic Plan. Discussion followed each presentation during which stakeholders raised questions and concerns and provided comments. Presentation materials used by the speakers are included as Attachment F. Transcribed facilitator's flip chart notes can be found at Attachment G.

Prior to the meeting, expected participants were provided with the EPA Draft Background Document, *Options for the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water Information Strategy* (Attachment C), and discussion papers of the ASDWA/EPA Data Management Steering Committee (Attachment D) were provided to participants prior to the meeting. In addition, an EPA/Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) fact sheet, *A Blueprint for the National Environmental Information Network* (Attachment E) was distributed at the meeting.

Background

Acknowledging that information is critical to the management of major national programs and shapes responses to rapidly changing events in the public health arena, and in order to maintain credibility in a data-driven environment, OGWDW has initiated efforts to bring its information management into strategic alignment with the needs of both its internal and external stakeholders. Since development of the existing information strategy in 1992, information technology has improved, and the process for developing drinking water standards has changed significantly. In addition, the private sector provides examples of reduced costs and improved decision support systems using the current technology. EPA now seeks to develop and implement a new strategy that responds to evolving technology and

[1] The meeting was held at the offices of RESOLVE, Inc., and facilitated by Lee Langstaff, a Senior Mediator with RESOLVE, with assistance from Jeff Citrin, Senior Associate.

regulatory needs, maximizes efficiency and minimizes cost of data transactions, meets national water program needs, and links efficiently to relevant data sources.

This OGWDW Information Strategy is a first step in revising its Information Strategic Plan (ISP) to focus on essential data reporting and analyses supporting decisions of the national ground water and drinking water programs to protect public health. The objective of the OGWDW Information Strategy is to identify a range of actions that can be taken in the near term to modernize its information systems. The intermediate and longer-term objective of the ISP is to define achievable direction that recognizes evolving information needs and technology, and effective and efficient information management to support public health protection.

SUMMARY

A. EPA Goals

In describing the overall context in which this effort is taking place, EPA staff explained that the National Water Program is tasked with the protection of public health and the nation's water resources. To meet the requirements of the Program, high quality data must be collected and managed to provide useful information to decision-makers, the public, and other stakeholders. Currently, some data needed by the Program is not readily available, making certain program Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) goals – which allow EPA to show measurable improvements in environmental quality and public health, and consequently contribute to better decision-making – difficult to measure.

EPA recognizes that its approach to information collection and management is in need of modernization. Some of the problems with the infrastructure systems that support the current Information Strategic Plan (ISP) include:

- the system is old;
- it is expensive to operate, modify, and maintain;
- it is focused on Public Water Supply Supervision (PWSS) violations and so does not meet the full range of needs;
- it is difficult to link to other significant data sources within the Office of Water and outside EPA; and
- it is not fully consistent with Office of Environmental Information (OEI) standards.

The need for OGWDW to become more responsive to internal and external data and analytical needs as well as to improve cost control points to the necessity for a *paradigm shift* in the way information is managed and related decisions are made.

EPA acknowledged that, while its information systems must serve multiple functions and should be useful to a variety of users both within and external to the Agency, the primary focus of the data contained in these systems must be to support EPA's essential business needs. EPA has begun efforts to define these core business needs, but also welcomed the opportunity to hear from stakeholders on

this task. An additional goal of EPA in this process is to employ newer technology to improve system efficiency and make future modernization easier.

Under a new ISP, over the next five years OGWDW's information systems will: 1) obtain drinking water and source water data relevant to public health protection through appropriate means from the regulated community; 2) support measurement of program progress and decisions affecting compliance of the regulated community as well as program management and direction, including development of standards and regulation review; and 3) provide reliable information to the public.

The series of presentations and stakeholder discussions at the meeting followed closely the structure of the Options paper prepared and distributed in advance by EPA: *Options for the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water Information Strategy (Working Draft)* (see Attachment C). The topic areas included:

- Defining Data Needs and Uses
- Reporting
- Improving System Performance
- Improving Data Quality
- Data Access and Utilization
- System Economics
- Consideration of Alternate Visions of Future Information Management

EPA emphasized the importance of stakeholder involvement throughout the information strategy development process, especially to assist EPA to identify roles and business processes that rely on water quality data and enhance stakeholder access to data.

A. Comments and Issues Raised by Stakeholders

The comments and issues raised by participants fell into several themes, sometimes but not necessarily specific to a particular topic area. These themes and discussion highlights are summarized below.

1. Need for EPA to Define Business Needs for the Drinking Water and Source Water Data

A persistent theme emphasized throughout the meeting by participants was the need for EPA to focus its information strategy first and foremost on collecting and managing those data needed to support the agency's core business needs, rather than simply "counting widgets" because you can. Clear identification of these core business needs must be the first step. Further, it was suggested that to do this, it is critical to define and clarify the questions which the data is needed to answer to thoroughly define the information needs.

EPA responded to this concern by describing the fundamental information needs that they have defined. These needs are primarily associated with 1) meeting statutory requirements, and 2) assessing results of Agency actions. Among the agency's specific business needs for the information are to:

- Provide oversight and backstopping for delegated PWSS programs (compliance data especially);
- Supporting the six year review of existing drinking water regulations and other ancillary needs;
- Identify emerging contaminants/ contaminants;
- Develop new regulations;
- Ensure the public health protection of sensitive subpopulations;
- Measure the effectiveness of source water protection programs and identify new approaches and methods for source water protection;
- Inform and make information available to the public.

In considering this list, participants urged EPA to consider for which of the identified needs it is necessary to require all systems to collect and report data (e.g. violations/compliance), and for which it would be sufficient to have representative sampling of some kind (e.g. source water protection).

In determining data needs, participants urged EPA to consider what analyses will be done and how they will be done to fully inform decisions about what data to ask for.

Participants noted that there is likely to be overlap between state needs for data and those of EPA. So, it seems probable that the value of gathering and maintaining certain information would be leveraged due to its usefulness to both groups. Further, it is quite possible that some of this information is already being required by states and so, while making it available to EPA would entail some additional reporting efforts by states, it may not necessarily place additional monitoring requirements on PWSs.

EPA noted that – as part of this exercise – there is an attempt to understand and define the needs that other information stakeholders have for this data. States voiced the concern that, while it is appropriate for EPA to appreciate where common needs exist, EPA should leave states' definition of their own data needs to the states and not interfere with this process or state's collection and management of their required data. States reminded EPA that as primacy agents under the PWSS program, specified state regulatory agencies have discretion to require reporting of additional data elements by PWSs. For example, states may have set different standards in their programs that are more stringent than the federal standards. Consequently, their data needs may go beyond collecting violation data based on the MCL and may be more stringent than those of interest to EPA.

In response to suggestions for seeking opportunities to integrate and/or coordinate Clean Water Act (CWA) and Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) information needs, state participants expressed discomfort with using drinking water data for CWA purposes. EPA explained that it plans to look into the extent to which CWA and SDWA information needs are mutually complementary, including considering the potential use of CWA information in forming its characterization of a national water program information strategy. Participants called for increased dialogue between EPA staff that work

on SDWA issues and those that support the agency's work related to the CWA. It was further suggested that linking waste water and drinking water data systems is another potential approach to expanding the available information set for use in characterizing the national water program.

8. Increased Reporting Burden and Resistance to New Information Requirements

While acknowledging EPA's genuine need for some the data currently collected, and for some additional data items. State representatives expressed significant concern over the prospect of increased data collection and reporting burden placed on states by EPA.

In response to questions raised by participants about whether the new information strategy might eliminate some of the existing information requirements rather than just add new ones, EPA representatives stated that the agency is prepared to consider dropping any current data requirements that do not contribute to meeting the information needs that are defined and articulated by the new strategy.

States pointed out that a shift by EPA to new information systems, such as SDWIS-Plus, could place a large burden on some states, particularly those that have developed their own unique information systems. They cautioned that in the planning stages, EPA should take steps to consider the burden on states associated with the introduction of any modifications to EPA information systems. These considerations should then be incorporated into the decision of whether the new or modified systems are necessary and, if so, how they should be structured and implemented.

States pointed out some specific dimensions of the added burden that should not be neglected, including the need to clarify who is responsible for entering data into the EPA information systems and to consider the ease of the method for providing and transmitting the data to EPA.
In addition, it was noted that, in some states, modification to the PWS reporting requirements requires changes to legislative statutes. This process, which can be time intensive and difficult, may take up to two years to complete. States noted their strong preference minimizing the need to seek such changes.

Acknowledging the discomfort of states with the potential for new information requirements, EPA asked for clarification from states regarding whether the potential burden is the key concern or if there is reluctance on the part of states to share certain data with EPA. States responded that the answer is somewhat complicated. State representatives at the meeting responded by emphasizing that their resistance is not a function of not wanting the EPA or anyone else to have their data. The potential added burden is the greatest concern, but is also coupled with real concerns regarding how the supplied data may be used or interpreted by EPA or the public.

State representatives noted their chief concern that data collected for one reason might be inappropriately used for other purposes. In fact, it was felt that secondary users of data are almost certain to use data for purposes it was not originally intended. There may be associated concerns about whether the quality control standards used in collecting the data support the alternative purposes

for which the data are used. Further, important metadata may become separated from the primary data to which it is related, compromising the value of primary data or providing a misleading impression when it is taken out of context. It was noted that systems like ECOFACTS, which search multiple databases to supply all available media-specific data within a specified geographic area, may provide deceptive information because the appropriate caveats and contexts are not adequately provided or impressed upon the user. States were wary that EPA or the public might use such data to unfairly second guess state PWSS programs.

A participant noted that in SDWIS/FED, if a sample is missed, the PWS is required to report a violation for all 37 chemicals monitored. This is burdensome to counties that must enter the violation data.

Some states voiced concerns related to the flow of information to EPA. It was suggested by some state participants that EPA could collect selected data directly from PWSs or laboratories as a way of minimizing added burden on the state. However, others indicated that because states have both primacy and regulatory authority, EPA should acquire all data directly from the states primary agency and not circumvent them by collecting data from labs or PWSs.

Finally, with regard to the tension between the federal and state agencies over information requirements, it was noted that in some cases requests for more information are perceived as a display of a lack of trust or a threat to states, and that the new information will be used for increased enforcement and compliance activities. It was suggested that this is a serious communication problem that might be alleviated by entering into some kind of performance partnership agreements.

9. Data Quality

Participants raised concerns that the quality of data submitted to EPA information systems might be uneven, in part related to the excessive burden on the states. Representatives from PWSs and states noted that they would need convenient access to data from their utilities and jurisdictions, respectively, to be able to correct data posted to EPA information systems – preferably via the internet – in a timely manner. They also noted the need for timely notification of potentially problematic records in order to feel more comfortable with quality control and thoroughness. It was suggested that off-the-shelf computer applications are now available to do this.

10. Issues Related to Specific Data Needs

Participants had much to say about the need for data that provides the ability to tie sample data to locational/geographic information. There was mixed perspective on this topic. The ability to recognize potential relationships between multiple data points and sources was cited as an important capability for many participants. However, several significant challenges to accomplishing this goal were considered.

Although accurate geospatial data (e.g., latitude, longitude, and depth) is needed, this complex and potentially expensive-to-gather data is not universally or consistently collected at present. Simply reporting zip codes will not work because there may be multiple sources and PWSs within a zip code. Conversely, a source or PWS may span several zip codes.

Combining underground injection control (UIC), source water protection, and PWSS data may be possible with the use of GIS. However, many state programs with primacy responsibilities do not collect UIC or source water data, leaving these responsibilities to sister agencies with which there is limited coordination, at best. Additional coordination would be required to ensure the collection of consistent and comparable geospatial data. Further, because collection of source water protection data is voluntary, states may be reluctant to take on this additional task – including the collection of the associated locational data – without dropping other data collection tasks that they already perform. An additional related challenge is that, if the states choose not to collect this data, it is unclear who will.

Participants agreed that rather than building new databases to accept certain parametric data and other metadata, the EPA information systems should contain placeholders so that they are able to accept these data elements. EPA noted that it has not yet determined whether reporting of these data elements will be voluntary or compulsory, or part of the regulatory reporting process.

Finally, it was suggested that there may be data elements that are only needed for some limited period of time (i.e. information related to the effectiveness of a particular treatment technology). This should be acknowledged and the data should not be requested past the time of its usefulness.

11. Information System Quality

Many participants noted concern that any future EPA information system should be designed and maintained such that it can perform at improved levels over and with greater reliability than the current SDWIS/STATE system. The Pivot Tables presented by EPA were thought to be a good stand-alone tool for use as a substitute to direct connection to the EPA databases. Although the pivot tables are static snapshots of the data, EPA offered to work with states to refresh the tables as frequently as needed and practical.

Participants were supportive of EPA's move toward modifying the drinking water databases to be web-based (e.g., in XML format), which was anticipated to make access easier and more efficient.

While states advocated for more frequent updating of SDWIS/STATE over SDWIS/FED, they advised against major investments in modifications to SDWIS/FED in light of the plan for developing a replacement system. States also indicated that they do not wish to submit data to multiple systems. Though in the interim to accommodate reporting of data as a result of new rules, it was suggested that states provide the new rule data in spreadsheet format based on a template developed by EPA. EPA might then use these spreadsheets to feed data into new modules that can link to the new system under

development. The new system might be created from these modules, which could also be used as the vehicle to transfer data from the old system.

12. Access and Ease of Use for the Full Range of Users

In addition to the comments made by state representatives noting concern that systems should allow them convenient access, input, and error correction, representatives of other stakeholder groups, particularly those from public interest groups and industry, expressed their hope that the databases be easy to use (even for the new user), current, and consistently available on demand. They agreed that making these systems web-based was desirable from the perspective of broad distribution and on-demand availability.

A state representative observed that the nature of the queries received in recent years had changed. Consumers are no longer the primary inquirants about water data. Businesses and banks now routinely call for flow and hardness data and other information. The needs of these groups should be considered in the design of the systems and the planning of their content.

Participants also noted that packaged reports could also be made available to suit the varying needs of the different levels of users. To meet the needs of some users, it may be necessary to make some of these reports available in a printed format.

Participants suggested the following strategies with respect to facilitating accessibility of water information to persons with disabilities:

- Provide optional formats that accommodate large monitors;
- Avoid the use of frames on Web pages;
- Avoid using certain colors (e.g., red); and
- Minimize the use of Java applets, which may remain on the user's system after they have exited the Web site.

EPA was also advised to consult with other federal agencies to learn what actions they have taken, taking note of the successes and failures.

5. Communication and Integration Among Internal Stakeholders

EPA staff in a variety of offices and regions has different responsibilities with respect to drinking and source water research, policy making, implementation, and enforcement. Consequently, within EPA there are different perspectives on the needs that could be served by a revised information strategy.

Participants agreed that greater interaction should occur between data and technology managers (in OEI and OW) and policy staff, both within and external to EPA (e.g., in discussions with ASDWA, AWWA, etc.). Such discussions could yield benefits to the management of water quality and the

protection of public health. They acknowledged these specialists often find it difficult to collaborate with one another.

It was also pointed out that data management staff is commonly brought in after critical policy discussions have taken place. This may result in directions that are difficult to implement or inconsistent with the intent of the policy decisions. Improved communications between these groups is expected to emphasize to all involved that policy and management issues are closely related.

C. Alternate Visions of Future Information Management

Toward the end of the meeting, Chuck Job (EPA Team Leader for this effort) shared the OGWDW approach to several alternate visions of future information management. He emphasized that the different potential approaches share a common set of principles derived from the EPA Office of Water ISP Performance Assessment. These principles include

A. Common functions should share information business systems
B. Replicate storage of data should be minimized
C. Common data element definitions will enhance data sharing and comparability
D. Data should be stored in databases and retrieved and analyzed using separate state-of-the-art analytical software
E. Data should be easily accessible for analysis

Mr. Job briefly described four potential visions (see the EPA Options Paper – Attachment C – for full descriptions):

1. an extension of the existing Safe Drinking Water Access and Retrieval System (SDWARS) for unregulated contaminants.
2. the "post and exchange" or "come and get it" approach used by the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS)
3. an approach based on SDWIS/STATE
4. an approach based on SDWIS/FED

In response, participants emphasized several points:

- The missing piece in all of these approaches is the world wide web – a combination of the web and XML is a good idea regardless of which model is used as a base
- Whichever is used, the design should be for future implementability, not just today's
- More than one of these may need to be combined to address the range of different needs.
- Comments regarding Option 1: It may be good for UCMR and special studies, but raises concerns about compliance and violations data not going through states. A mechanism would be needed to ensure state access and review of their data before is can be used by others for various purposes.

- Comments regarding Option 3: This approach is guiding EPA Office of Environmental Information at a macro scale. Some states are already geared towards this approach. Key issues are timeliness and accessibility for QA/QC. Some cautioned that this approach could set up a competition between EPA and the states. A strength of this approach is that it reflects the underlying institutional and legal structure that the whole system serves (e.g. labs are accountable to PWS that hires them; PWSs are accountable to their state; states are accountable to EPA). However, a potential problem might be bottlenecks at the state level. Also, it is important to keep in mind that ECOS is pollution-prevention oriented, and drinking water needs may be different.

Several participants encouraged EPA to thoroughly explore opportunities in the commercial market place to help address this effort.

D. Next Steps

Chuck Job, OGWDW, thanked participants for their valuable feedback at this meeting and highlighted the following next steps; a comprehensive time line and list of next steps can be found on pages 27 and 28 of the EPA Draft Background Document (Attachment C):

- OGWDW will continue to work with stakeholders both internal and external to EPA to identify opportunities for consolidating some of the reporting requirements – in the six months (approximately) following the meeting.
- Concurrently, the Protection Branch will work to define business measures for source water and UIC and their associated information requirements.
- OGWDW will work with OW and OEI to integrate systems to reduce costs, improve data sharing, and facilitate the process by which states report data.
- Work to integrate agency data standards – six of which are currently available and an additional four are under development.
- Web-enable SDWIS/STATE.
- Complete revision of the ISP following completion of information requirements process –Summer 2001.
- Launch modernization of and implement the ISP – beginning in approximately three years.

Mr. Job concluded by reiterating that this meeting initiated a phase of the information strategy planning process and that stakeholders should feel free to continue communicating with OGWDW on these issues; additional comments are welcomed.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Meeting Agenda

B. List of Participants

C. EPA Draft Background Document, *Options for the Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water Information Strategy (Working Draft)*, U.S. EPA Office of Water, February 2001, EPA 816-P-01-001.[2]

D. ASDWA/EPA Data Management Steering Committee Discussion Papers[3]:

- *Guiding Principles for Information Requirements for Rule and Policy Development*, March 5, 2001,
- *SDWIS/FED Data Quality*, March 5, 2001.

C. EPA/ECOS fact sheet, *A Blueprint for the National Environmental Information Network*, January 2001.[4]

D. Presentation Materials from the Information Strategy Stakeholder Meeting[3]

E. Transcribed Facilitators' Flip Chart Notes

---

[2] At the time of the meeting, this document was available for download from the OGWDW drinking water data and databases web page, at URL http://www.epa.gov/safewater/databases.html.

[3] Copies of these materials are available on request from Mr. Jeff Bryan, U.S. EPA - OGWDW, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606), Washington, DC 20460; Ph: 202/260-4934; Fax: 202/401-3041; E-mail: bryan.jeffrey@epa.gov.

[4] At the time of the meeting, this document was available for download from the ECOS web page, at URL http://www.sso.org/ecos/eie/network-blueprint.pdf.

Attachment A

PROPOSED AGENDA

Meeting Objectives: Obtain Stakeholder input on issues, options and directions affecting the future of national drinking water and source water information systems supporting the protection of public health.

THURSDAY, MARCH 8

8:30 – 9:00 Coffee, registration

9:00 – 9:30 Welcome, Introductions
Lee Langstaff, Facilitator

9:30 – 9:50 Opening Remarks
- *Cynthia Dougherty, Director*
  Office of Groundwater and Drinking Water (OGWDW)
- Context and Purpose of Meeting - *Bill Diamond, Director, Drinking Water Protection Division (DWPD)*

9:50 – 10:00 Review Agenda and Participation Guidelines
Lee Langstaff

10:00 – 10:15 Status Report & Overview of Existing Information Systems Supporting OGWDW
Jeff Bryan and Systems Managers – EPA/OGWDW

10:15 – 10:30 BREAK

10:30 – 11:15 Processes Affecting Information Systems Supporting OGWDW
- Overview - *Chuck Job*
- Office of Water Information Strategic Plan - *Andrew Battin, Office of Water (OW)*
- Office of Environmental Information – *OEI Representative, Invited*

11:15 – 12:15 Discussion Session I: Defining Data Needs and Uses
Brief Orientation Presentation for Each Question

a) How will OGWDW ensure that it has the data it needs to implement its programs, address data gaps and coordinate with other EPA programs?
   - PWS supervision (PWSS) program implementation and coordination (*Abe Siegel*)
   - Source water & underground injection control (UIC) data gaps *(Roy Simon)*

c) What essential information does the primary agency need in order to ensure safe drinking water is being provided? (*Abe Siegel*)

12:15 – 1:15 LUNCH

1:15 – 3:15 Defining Data Needs and Uses (cont'd)

d) What parametric and ancillary data should be reported to make them of greatest use? (*Larry Weiner*)
e) What data does EPA need to judge and evaluate the success of its programs? (*Fran Haertel*)
f) How should EPA foster improved processes for identification and confirmation of data requested of primacy agencies? (*Ed Cottrill*)
g) Are there other priority data uses EPA should consider? (*Roger Anzzolin*)

3:15 – 3:30 BREAK

3:30 – 4:45 Discussion Session II: Reporting
Brief Orientation Presentation for Each Question

a) What changes are necessary to ensure we obtain correct data, while minimizing reporting burden for existing and upcoming rules? (*Clint Lemmons*)
b) How should EPA obtain parametric drinking water data to address future information requirements? (*Larry Weiner*)
c) What improvements to SDWIS should EPA make to allow for easier data entry by states? (*Fran Haertel*)

4:45 – 5:00 Summarize and Wrap Up for the Day

FRIDAY, MARCH 9

8:30 – 8:45 Opening Remarks and Review Agenda for the Day

8:45 – 10:00 Discussion Session III: Improving System Performance
Brief Orientation Presentation for Each Question

a) How can EPA improve the performance of its information systems, given that any improvements would require states to make near-term adjustments to

achieve long-term reporting benefits? (*Abe Siegel*)

10:00 – 10:15 BREAK

10:15 – 11:15 Discussion Session IV: Improving Data Quality
Brief Orientation Presentation for Each Question

a) What steps should EPA take to improve data quality? (*Fran Haertel*)
b) What EPA standards must OGWDW address in its information systems? (*Fran Haertel*)

11:15 – 12:15 Discussion Session V: Data Access and Utilization
Brief Orientation Presentation for Each Question

a) How should EPA improve retrieval and dissemination of data contained in SDWIS/FED? (*Lee Kyle*)
b) How should public access to drinking water data be improved? (*Lee Kyle*)
c) What does OGWDW need to do to ensure accessibility of electronic information and computer systems for people with disabilities, in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998? (*Ed Cottrill*)

12:15 – 1:15 LUNCH

1:15 – 2:45 Discussion Session VI: System Economics
Brief Orientation Presentation for Each Question

a) What steps should EPA take to make OGWDW information systems more economically efficient? (*Jeff Bryan*)

2:45 – 3:00 BREAK

3:00 – 4:00 Discussion Session VII: Consideration of Alternate Visions of Future Information Management
Chuck Job

a) Single Shared Electronic Space
b) Post and Exchange
c) Specified SDWIS-STATE Format
d) Status Quo Using SDWIS-FED

4:00 – 4:45 Identification of Outstanding Issues
Lee Langstaff

4:45 – 5:00 Next Steps and Wrap-up
Lee Langstaff

5:00 ADJOURN

Attachement B

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Brad Addison
Program Manager
Drinking Water Compliance Prog.
205 Butler Street, SE
Suite 1362
Atlanta, GA 30334
E-mail: brad_addison@dnr.state.ga.us

Roger Anzzolin
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/IAD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: anzzolin.roger@ EPA.gov

Thomas Becker
New York State Dept. of Health
Center for Environmental Health
Bur. of Public Water Supply Prot'n.
2 University Place - Room 410
Albany, NY 12203-3313

Faysal Bekdash
Sr. Environmental Engineer
Science Applications International Corporation
11251 Roger Bacon Drive
Reston, VA 20190
E-mail: faysal.bekdash@saic.com

Anthony Bennett
Team Leader
Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission
Public Drinking Water (MC 155)
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087
E-mail: tbennett@tnrcc.state.tx.us

Andy Bielanski
Environmental Engineer
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/DWPD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: bielanski.andrew@epa.gov

Elizabeth Bolak
Project Manager
INDUS Corporation
1953 Gallows Road, Suite 300
Vienna, VA 22182
E-mail: elizabeth.bolak@induscorp.com

Cliff Bowen
Sr. Sanitary Engineer
California Dept. of Health Services
2151 Berkeley Way, Room 458
Berkeley, CA 94704
E-mail: Cbowen1@dhs.ca.gov

Jeff Bryan
Associate Branch Chief
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: bryan.jeffrey@epa.gov

Heather Bryden
Team Lead for Systems Analysis
Science Applications International Corp.
6565 Arlington Blvd.
Falls Church, VA 22042
E-mail:
brydenh@sdc-moses.com

Jennifer Burnham
Consumer Safety Officer
U.S. Food and Drug Admin.
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
200 C St., SW
HFS 306
Washington, DC 20204
E-mail: jennifer.burnham@cfsan.fda.gov

Robert D. Burns
Regional Expert,
Drinking Water Data Mgmt.
U.S. EPA Region IV,
Water Management Div.
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303
E-mail: Burns.Robert@ epa.gov

George Campbell
Environmental Services Mgr.
Cytec Industries
1300 Mt. Kemble Ave.
Morristown, NJ 07960
E-mail: george_campbell@gm.cytec.com

Guy A. Caruthers
Information Mgmt. Specialist
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/SRMD/TAB
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4607)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: caruthers.guy@epa.gov

Peter Censky
Executive Director
Water Quality Association
4151 Naperville Road
Lisle, IL 60532

E-mail: peter17@ix.netcom.com

Marla Cochran
Director, Regulatory Affairs & Product Safety
ATOFINA Chemicals, Inc.
2000 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3222
E-mail: marla.cochran@atofina.com

Kevin Conner
Dyncorp
6101 Stevenson Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22304
Ph: 703/461-2394
E-mail: connerK@dyncorp.com

Matt Corson
Assn. of State Drinking Water Administrators
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 903
Washington, DC 20036
E-mail: asdwa@erols.com

Ed Cottrill
SDWIS/STATE Project Mgr.
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: cottrill.edward@epa.gov

Dave Crump
Manager Business Development
Parsons Advanced Technologies Inc.
2751 John St.
Markham, ON L3R 2Y8 CANADA
E-mail: dcrump@protectair.com

Anthony DeRosa
Assn. of State Drinking Water Administrators
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 903
Washington, DC 20036
E-mail: asdwa@erols.com

Towana Dorsey
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: dorsey.towana@EPA.gov

Ron Entringer
Chief, Program Implementation Sect.
New York Department of Health
Bur. of Public Water Supply Prot'n.
Flanigan Square
547 River Street
Troy, NY 12180-2216
E-mail: RAE01@health.state.ny.us

Nicole Foley
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: foley.nicole@EPA.gov

Marcie Francis
Senior Science Policy Director
Chlorine Chemistry Council
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22209
E-mail:
Marcie_Francis@americanchemistry.com

Chris Frebis
Statistician
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
Technical Support Center
26 W. Martin Luther King Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45268
E-mail: frebis.chris@epa.gov

Pat Garvey
Special Assistant
U.S. EPA - OEI/OIC
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (2823)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: garvey.pat@epa.gov

Michael Gehron
Vice President
Marasco Newton Group
2801 Clarendon Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22201
E-mail: mgehron@marasconewton.com

John Gilchrist
SAIC
6565 Arlington Blvd.
Falls Church, VA 22042
E-mail: gilchristj@saic.com

Kate Gilmore
Sanitarian Program Manager
Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals
Office of Public Health
Center for Environmental Health
6867 Bluebonnet Blvd., Box 3
Baton Rouge, LA 70810
E-mail: kgilmore@dhh.state.la.us

Rich Gomez
SDWIS/FED Coordinator
U.S. EPA - Region VIII, ECEJ (P&T)
999 18th St., Suite 500
Denver, CO 80202
E-mail: gomez.rich@EPA.gov

Fran Haertel
U.S. EPA - Region VI, OGWDW/IB
Fountain Place
1445 Ross Avenue (6WQ-SD)
Dallas, TX 75202-2733
E-mail: haertel.frances@epa.gov

George Hallberg
Principal
The Cadmus Group
135 Beaver St.
Waltham, MA 02452
E-mail: ghallberg@cadmusgroup.com

Ann Hanger
U.S. EPA-OGWDW/DWPD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: hanger.ann@epa.gov

Tom Hart
New York Department of Health
Bur. of Public Water Supply Prot'n.
Flanigan Square
547 River Street
Troy, NY 12180-2216
E-mail: TFH01@health.state.ny.us

Dennis Herrin
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: herrin.dennis@epa.gov

Donna Hickling
Assistant Vice President
Science Applications International Corporation
6565 Arlington Blvd.
Falls Church, VA 22042
E-mail: hicklingd@sdc-moses.com

Michelle M. Hoover
Program Manager
U.S. EPA - Region III,
Water Protection Division
1650 Arch Street, 3WP22
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029
E-mail: hoover.michelle@epa.gov

Harriet Hubbard
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: hubbard.harriet@EPA.gov

Ron Hunsinger
Manager of Water Quality
American Water Works Association & East Bay Municipal Utility District
375 11th Street
Oakland, CA 94607
E-mail: rhunsing@ebmud.com

Karen Irion
Administrator, Safe Drinking Water Program
Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals
Office of Public Health
Ctr. for Envt'l. Health Services
6867 Bluebonnet Blvd.
Baton Rouge, LA 70810
E-mail: kirion@dhh.state.la.us

James Jerpe
Environmental Engineer
U.S. EPA - Region III, NAHE
203 Holly Ct.
Stevensville, MD 21666
E-mail: Jerpe@intercom.net;
jerpe.james@EPA.gov

Chuck Job
Chief, Infrastructure Branch
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/DWPD/IB
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4607)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: job.charles@epa.gov

Peggy Johnson
Division Services Manager
Washington State Dept. of Health
P.O. Box 47849
Olympia, WA 98504-7849
E-mail: peggy.johnson@doh.wa.gov

Sandra Krietzman
Environmental Scientist
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
P.O. Box 426
Trenton, NJ 08625-0426
E-mail: skrietzm@dep.state.nj.us

Lee Kyle
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: kyle.lee@epa.gov

Jim Laity
Policy Analyst
Office of Management and Budget
Office of Info. & Reg'y Affairs/
Natural Resources
NEOB, Room 10202
725 17th St., NW
Washington, DC 20503
E-mail: laity-j@a1.eop.gov

Clint Lemmons
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: lemmons.clint@epa.gov

Katie Leo
U.S. EPA-OGWDW/DWPD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: leo.katie@EPA.gov

Robert Lewis
Deputy Executive Director for
Federal Relations
Ntl. Assn. of Water Companies
1725 K Street, NW, Suite 1212
Washington, DC 20006
E-mail: Bob@nawc.com

Joe Lewis
Information Mgmt. Specialist
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/DWPD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: lewis.joe@epa.gov

Amal Mahfouz
Senior Toxicologist
U.S. EPA - OW/OST
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4304)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: mahfouz.amal@epa.gov

Jeff Mosher
Assn. of Metropolitan Water
Agencies
1717 K Street, NW
Suite 801
Washington, DC 20036
E-mail: jeff@amwa.net

Tom Nakley
Engineer
U.S. EPA - Small Business Division
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (1808)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: nakley.thomas@epa.gov

Rick Naylor
U.S. EPA-OGWDW/DWPD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: naylor.richard@epa.gov

Joshua Nemzer
U.S. EPA - Region I
1 Congress St., Suite 1100
CMU
Boston, MA 02214-2023
E-mail: nemzer.josh@EPA.gov

Vinh Nguyen
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: nguyen.vinh@epa.gov

Brand Niemann
U.S. EPA - OEI/OIC
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (2822)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: niemann.brand@epa.gov

Paul Orum
Director
Working Group on Community
Right-to-Know
218 D St., SE
Washington, DC 20003
E-mail: paul_orum@yahoo.com

Phil Oshida
U.S. EPA - OW/OWOW/WD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4502F)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: oshida.phil@epa.gov

Terryl A. Pajor
Laboratory & Operations Director
City of Wichita Water/ AWWA
Water Treatment Plant
1815 W. Pine Street
Wichita, KS 67203
E-mail: pajor_t@ci.wichita.ks.us

Glenn Patterson
Hydrologist,
Office of Water Quality
U.S. Geological Survey
Water Resources Division
412 National Center, Room 5A-106
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, MS 412
Reston, VA 20192
E-mail: gpatter@usgs.gov

Fred W. Pontius
Pontius Water Consultants, Inc.
P.O. Box 150361
Lakewood, CO 80215-0361
E-mail: fredp@pontiuswater.com;
pontiusf@colorado.edu

Lee Prasaud
Head-Information Technology
Services (Acting)
Ontario Ministry of Environment
40 St. Clair Ave. W, 11th Floor
Toronto, ON M4V 1M2 CANADA
E-mail: lee.prasaud@gov.on.ca

Mark Rasso
Data Management Coordinator
U.S. EPA - Region II
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007
E-mail: rasso.mark@epa.gov

Carl Reeverts
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/IAD
337 9th St., SE
Washington, DC 20003
E-mail: reeverts.carl@epa.gov

Jeff Rosen
Technology Planning & Management
Corp./ AWWA
Mill Wharf Plaza
Suite 208
Scituate, MA 02066
E-mail: jrosen@tpmcscituate.com

Bill Ryan
Geologist
U.S. EPA - Region V
Water Division WG-16J
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604
E-mail: ryan.williamj@epa.gov

Carie Schaffer
Marasco Newton Group
2801 Clarendon Blvd.
Arlington, VA 22201
E-mail: cschaffer@marasconewton.com

Steve Schmidt
Director, Envt'l. Compliance
American Water Works Service Co.
1025 Laurel Oak Road
P.O. Box 1770
Voorhees, NJ 08043
E-mail: sschmidt@amwater.com

Julie Schrimp
Consumer Safety Officer
U.S. Food and Drug Admin.
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
200 C St., SW
Washington, DC 20204
E-mail: jschrimp@cfsan.fda.gov

Andrew Schulman
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4607)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: schulman.andrew@epa.gov

Abe Siegel
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: siegel.abraham@epa.gov

Paul South
Consumer Safety Officer
U.S. Food and Drug Admin.
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition
200 C St., SW (HFS-306)
Washington, DC 20204
E-mail: paul.south@cfsan.fda.gov

Kenna Study
Environmental Manaager
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Drinking Water Section
2600 Blairstone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32301
E-mail: kenna.study@dep.state.fl.us

Ed Thomas
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: thomas.edwin@epa.gov

Sherri Umansky
U.S. EPA - OGWDW/SRMD
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4602)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: umansky.sherri@ epa.gov

Monte Waugh
Technical Services Assistant
Virginia Department of Health
Division of Water Supply
(VDH - OWD - DWSE)
1500 East Main St., Room 109
Richmond, VA 23219
E-mail: mwaugh@vdh.state.va.us

Larry Weiner
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4606)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: weiner.larry@epa.gov

Karen Wirth
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (4607)
Washington, DC 20460
E-mail: wirth.karen@epa.gov

Patti Kay Wisniewski
U.S. EPA - Region III
1650 Arch Street (3WP22)
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029
E-mail: wisniewski.patti-kay@EPA.gov

Barbara Wysock
Environmental Engineer
U.S. EPA - OGWDW
Technical Support Center
26 W. Martin Luther King Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45268
E-mail: wysock.barbara@epa.gov

Cindy Yablonski
International Bottled Water Assn.
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 650
Alexandria, VA 22314
E-mail: cyablons@bottledwater.org

Michael Young
Business Development Manager
Parsons Advanced Technologies Inc.
2751 John Street
Markham, ON L3R 2Y8 CANADA
E-mail: mike.young@parsons.com or myoung@protectair.com

Facilitation Team

Jeff Citrin
Associate
RESOLVE, Inc.
1255 23rd Street, NW
Suite 275
Washington, DC 20037
E-mail: jcitrin@resolv.org

Lee M. Langstaff
Senior Mediator
RESOLVE, Inc.
1255 23rd St., NW
Suite 275
Washington, DC 20037
E-mail: llangstaff@resolv.org

EPA Information Strategy Stakeholders Meeting

March 8-9, 2001

Facilitator's Flip Chart Notes

Key Issues/Concerns

- Occurrence data
- How to deal with developing info systems – capture and delivery to public
- Data drives policy
- Implementation of new rules
  - big task
  - data quality
- Integration of data – utility, state and federal levels
- Integration of facility ID information
- Keeping data set simple enough to be able to work with it
- Data collection and reporting burden – potential impacts on data quality
- Data quality
- Reporting burden
- Transition to data management
- Data integrity throughout decision making process.
- How to upload data
- How accurate data reporting
- SDWIS/FED development – listening for needs and ideas
- Selection of quality metrics
- Harmonization of data
- Effects on listed chemicals
- Ideas and options for improving information systems
- Public access to data regarding their water and enforcement data
- Implications for small business
- Implications for implementation of SDWIS-State
- Good quality data (occurrence and exposure)
- Data completeness for rule implementation
- Support for UCMR
- Understanding clear objective

Questions Regarding Existing Systems

- Will SDWARS be available to public?
  - *ultimately, yes*
- Which systems intended to be primary for public access?
  - *ultimately, SDWIS-Plus*
- Will state labs be able to upload to SDWARS?

- *lab that does analysis will do the reporting*
- *hopefully via www*

- Will there be opportunity for QA/QC by utilities in phase 2?
  - *yes*

I. a) Source Water Contamination Prevention

- Guidance to states on TMDL – information/data?
  - *with stakeholders input – yes*
- Intend to look at CWA information to see if it is relevant to drinking water – if so, will look at it - if needed for EPA national picture – otherwise stay at state level -- geo ref (at intakes and wells) information needed to establish this possible relationship
- Will publish strategy in 3-6 weeks
- Drinking water information being used for CWA assessments – not seen in positive light - need more/better communication between SDWA and CWA people at EPA HQ and Regions
  - *this strategy is intended to start addressing this*
- Will more information be required from states for this?
  - *4 data items – in SDWS*
  - *no regulatory requirement to provide the information but a need for the information*
- Don't count widgets – focus on information needed to assess results
  - lot of counting inherent in table presented
  - locals not currently mandated to report this information to state – his effort required to get this data
  - *key to assess whether the information supports national picture, id who collects and how to get it to systems*
- Concern – source water prevention - a PWS responsibility?

  Systems only one piece of local architecture of prevention for systems

I. a) OGWDW Data Needs

- Need to ask: what analyses will be done, and how will they be done? (what questions and how data will be used to answer them)
- What documentation required to demonstrate quality of what is done with the data to ensure quality
- Can't see how to link UIC to PWS information without GIS
- Different places in different states have data on PWS, UIC and source water protection
- Caution against establishing an unwarranted relationship
- Relate all to geographic location – using consistent location information – link all different types of data to location. Then can ID potential for relationships – need good geospatial data
- Where is responsibility for collecting source water protection data –
  - voluntary
  - not required of PWS
  - state cup is full – collection of locational data means something else won't get done
- Real tension when creating central integrated system – means changes/compromises for managers and users of existing systems

- Those responsible for collecting the data should have primary weight
- Lat/long might answer data integration issues – then user needs to be able to identify their lat/long to make use of data (for intakes and wells)
- We have mechanism to get geospatial information for every PWS
- EPA information needs:
  - for six year review and other auxiliary needs
  - measures effectiveness of protection programs
  - identify contaminants for regulation
  - identify steps to provide source water protection
- Make best use of existing data collection programs (e.g. USGS)
- States have similar data needs themselves
- Locational data valuable, but knowing the limits of that data equally valuable – caution regarding using it inappropriately
  - must designate appropriate use/interpretation of locational data
- Also prepared to drop data requirements that are not needed
- Need to assess effectiveness of SDWA/ What is best way to do this? May not be in information systems we are looking it
- Threshold questions:
  1- need same level/extent of information from all PWSs?
  2- do we need to know about every violation?
- Have to ask what our job is in order to answer threshold questions
- Should we be doing business differently from when we set this up years ago (mostly to support enforcement and compliance)?
- Don't gear information collection requirements towards bad actors – trust PWS summary data
- Ontario – reviewing regulations and information required – and changed regulations – hold PWSs accountable to report their information
- Federal agency has to decide what its business is and the information needed to do it
- Different state programs have different standards – often more stringent than Federal – so collecting violation data based on state standards will be different than based on national MCL (and different/comparable to different states)
- Intelligent reporting software can tell you if lat/long matches a zip code, etc. – can help address burden issue
- Primacy program sets up fundamental tension between feds and state (butting heads) especially when it relates to a national DW program.
- Organize around customers/suppliers
- What at source of state/federal "butting heads"?
  - Requests for more data perceived as threat or display of lack of trust – for use in enforcement and compliance
  - Communication problem – e.g. performance partnership agreements
  - Tension because EPA management talks to state management but different communication at level of programs
  - Money from feds does not go to data reporting
  - Need consistent messages:
    Legislature

EPA management
EPA programs
State management
State programs
PWSs

- If EPA willing to make real change – get together with states (current approach doesn't work well)
- What data states provide to EPA really helps to protect public health?

➢ *EPA responsible to oversee and back stages state programs – needs this data to do this – see patterns and analysis of performance of program and take enforcement action in e.g. regions cases*
  - *Is this what it should be?*
  - Information on compliance doesn't do this
  - Provide data so EPA oversight is credible
  - Data currently asked for does not do this (not a valid use of the data being collected – especially lat/log; treatment technology.)

- If counting beans all the time, not paying as much attention to other things
- Utility responsible to <u>customer</u>
- One EPA business need – identifying <u>emerging</u> contaminants (UCMR)

<u>I. b) What data Needed to Evaluate Success and Where Can it From:</u>

- Parametric data from states may not address the data needs
- Reg. to inform public <u>plus</u> additional requirements – e.g. CCR
- For program evaluation collect through mid-year review (regions)
  - EPA come review the documents
  - Or 3-year review
- <u>Either</u> parametric or violation data
- Need occurrence with parametric

<u>EPA National Drinking Water Program</u>:

- Oversight and backstopping
  - compliance data critical for this

- Inform Public

- Address emerging contaminants
- Evaluate existing regulations
- Developing new regulations
  - affordability/economics of treatment
  - co-occurrence and treatment technologies
- Sensitive sub-pops

- Source water protection

- For backstop/oversight
  - violations/compliance data from states (outcome focus)
  - others systems set up for collecting other program evaluation needs
  - don't ask every system, but a sampling
- Need to define/clarify questions before identifying information needs
- Need basics:
  - what is in water, where
  - characteristics of system/effectiveness of treatment

- EPA Question:
- *Is it the reporting burden or that you don't want EPA to have it (the data)?*
  - ➢ Concern regarding how data will be used, interpreted by EPA or public and the limits of the data:
    - some of it is wrong
    - data collected for are reason may have different quality control that data collected for another purpose
    - needs to be properly handled
  - ➢ No problem sharing SDWIS/State data once up and running
  - ➢ Data – fine metadata if people willing to go get it
  - ➢ ICR huge burden – resistance not about sharing data
  - ➢ Concern regarding second-guessing state data/program

- Need for reporting tracking:
- distinguish between monitoring or reporting violation versus an MCL violation
  - lots more work!

I. c) Parametric Data

- Need data system with place holder for this data – don't want a new database
- Are we talking about voluntary, required, regulatory reporting?
- *not yet decided – what is appropriate and representative?*
  - Go through state
  - Any such requirement inappropriate as a regulation going around primacy state (conflict between primacy – direct implementation
  - UCMR not part of primacy – since by def unreg some states pleased not to be involved
  - Some states pleased NOT to be involved
- Are some data elements only needed for some period of time (i.e. effectiveness of treatment)?
- This data used especially for six-year review – to see if regs are doing what they are intended to do.
- Need meta–data on sample by sample basis – for accurate comparability of data
- Labs provide analytical data – their ID is included with their reports.
- Per system basis for list I contaminants (all large and some small systems) $3-4000/system (1 yr. monitoring)

I. e) How Communicate Better Between EPA and States

- Involve data people from states more in regulation development (*why have they not been there?* – has not been the emphasis)
- Participate in ASDWA meetings – and get data on the agenda – or establish sub-group on data
- Data management folks have taken a back seat – need to step up
- AWWA source water – ask what data elements are needed
- Include OEI in more of the discussions
- Hard for data and technology people to talk to each other

- tend to work separately – need to hear each other (lesson from ICR)
  - fine points get missed if technology people not involved – IT people need to be involved early
- Data sharing issues are management/policy issues – not for data "handlers" (data management staff)
  - how to collect data requested
  - data management a small piece
- EPA IMB newsletter is good
- Internally, EPA not getting their people together
- Drivers at state level (TX) are responsibilities to state legislature and to EPA and to water systems (what state agrees to do for a fee) (these become "performance measures" and have implications throughout the system)
- EPA sometimes doesn't research their own data before asking for more
  - smarter use of existing data
- Key is understanding the questions and data needed and then how collect, etc. (and if it needs to be collected or already exists)

I. f)

- No additional data requirements beyond PWSS program
- Geospatial data – very complex
  - vectors
  - adjacent/branches of watershed
  - etc.
  - need to be very clear what you want/need
  - very expensive
- Source water assessment data may be collected already, but in different systems – question of getting it to other systems
  - *link to this data*
- DW program is changing – prevention is emerging as more important – need to identify data needs and availability
- Look to waste-water program also – link WW and DW to share data
- Interactive mapping projects
- Need to know hydro geologic sensitivity of water source with source water assessment data
- States have history of protection activities that these new requirements interfere with.
- Secondary users of data – will use data in ways or for purposes not originally intended
- measuring success of protection

- no outbreak = success
- can only really "measure" failure
- outbreak is a trailing indicator – we need to look for leading indicators

• Need to define the value of data requested: define the business need – does the data meet the need?
  - EPA not the core business managers, but need to evaluate success of the business (of states)
  - EPA does get the requests for data – from other agencies/congress/public, etc. not always anticipated in past

II. a)

• How much data is electronically submitted?
  - most or all to EPA
  - to states: 0-80% - varies a lot (more chem. and rads than microbial)
  - electronic reporting makes burden much more manageable - need to get smart software to those reporting

  Why:
  - large labs can report electronically
  - small systems – report on paper (whoever owns the data reports)
  - capability of multiple labs varies
  - slow process – quality control issues – state wants oversight of quality control
  - small labs may not have LIM

• Goal – make electronic data exchange part of lab certification requirement
• Guidance for state reporting should be part of role development and rule when promulgated – not after the fact. (also, don't leave specific data requirements for after the rule).
• Proposed shift:
  - EPA define core data requirements
  - Establish partnerships/utilities to agree on other valuable information; state will collect and save.

- Develop directory of who has what data
- *(EPA – this is where we want to go)*

• Create a template for small systems (Ontario model)
• Pennsylvania:
  - going paperless
  - existing pilot projects
  - improve data quality – 1 set of data
  - inventory – SDWIS plus much more

II. b)

• Depends on questions you're asking
• Directory approach – not pull all data into one place

- Can CCR be modified to address these needs? A good vehicle that already exists

II. c)

- Desired frequency of new releases?
  - SDWIS/FED – annually (or not at all)
  - SDWIS/State – more often
    (currently other way around)
- No substitute for one-on-one communication with states (e-mail, phone)
- Go towards web-bases XML (post data outside firewall) – more efficient
- Still need violations linkages
  - caution against limiting flexibility of 4 methods – has implications for states
- More simultaneous release of SDWIS-Fed and State.

III.

- Leave SDWIS/FED as is and focus resources on developing new approach (XML/CDX)
  - takes states long time to put modifications in place
- equiv. question for states – don't' want to invest in addressing SDWIS/FED if something new is coming
- Question: how deal with SDWIS/FED regarding rules in the pipeline?
  - Just because SDWIS Fed can't handle data for new rule doesn't mean states are not collecting the required information
  - Not ask states to submit to 2 systems
  - How can EPA get this if SDWIS/FED not updated
    - States can provide spreadsheets
    - EPA provide format (what fits in SDWIS Feds in it and what doesn't – until new system is ready)
- In interim: create new modules that can link to new system
- Stop SDWIS/FED.....add appropriate fields to SDWIS/State and use SDWIS/State for now (to provide for needs of SDWIS/FED users)
- Keep as much as you can of what works well enough (data transfer causes problems so minimize it)
- Keep old system going as is -- modular approach to building new ones – transfer information module by module.
- Try not to change table structure but can add new codes to existing fields
- Continue to keep SDWIS/FED up to date (include modifications) – until new system can accommodate needs.

IV. Data Quality

- Do not require use of SDWIS/State..... a lot invested by some states in other systems
- Show us that data is really needed to answer questions
- Under-reporting of violations not in data issues – determination by state regarding appropriate reporting/monitoring frequency
- Only require major violations reported

- Problem: most violations at small systems – harder to get the data – emphasis on small systems needed
  - Community. vs. non-community esp. (for violations data)
- Unique identifier is critical
- Eliminate problem of recording violations for 30 chems because 1 sample missed
- Data quality not that bad – methodology to evaluate data quality paints states in worst light
- Difficulty in accessing systems to do QA/QC is a serious problem – fixing this would help (utility perspective) – standard internet access
- Timeliness related to above
- Provide cushion on late reporting (not call it a violation right away)
- Make it easier to update violations

Outstanding Questions

- How does stakeholder involvement process for this interface with stakeholder process for source water protection strategy development?
  - SWP – separate stakeholder process to identify measures – then hand off to this process